arXiv:1608.04445v1 [math.OA] 16 Aug 2016

Every bounded self-ajoint operator is a real linear combination of 4 orthoprojections

V. Rabanovich

August 17, 2016

Abstract

We prove that every bounded self-adjoint operator in Hilbert space is a real linear combination of 4 orthoprojections. Also we show that operators of the form identity minus compact positive operator can not be decomposed in a real linear combination of 3 orthoprojections. Using ideas applied in infinite dimensional space, we find $n \times n$ matrices that are not real linear combinations of 3 orthoprojections for every $n \geq 76$.

1 Introduction

We consider here linear combinations of orthogonal projections P_i, $P_i^* = P_i^2 = P_i$, on a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space H. It was proved in [5] that every bounded operator on H is a complex linear combination of 257 orhthoprojections. Later the author showed that every bounded self-adjoint operator A on H is a real linear combination of 9 orhthoprojections [4]. At the same time C. Pearcy and D. Topping proved that it is enough only 8 summands in the real combination [16]. Then it was established in [15] that the operator A is a real linear combination of 6 orhthoprojections. By modification of the proof in [15], K. Matsumoto diminished the number of summands in such a decomposition to 5 items [12]. The fact that not every Hermitian operator can be decomposed into a linear combination of two orthoprojections is known for many years due to some symmetry property of a linear combination of two orthoprojections (see Proposition 2.1). The most simple example of such an operator is a Hermitian operator in 4 dimensional space with eigenvalues 0.9, 1, 1.01 and 1.0001. So it remains to consider real combinations of 3 or 4 orthprojections. It was proved in [17] that every diagonizable self-adjoint operators is a real linear combination of 4 orthoprojections. Using some simple manipulations with self-commutators in Theorem 3.1, we give a short possibly new proof of this result for every self-adjoint operator. It should be noted that the authors from [2] considered decompositions of operators into a linear combinations of 4 orthoprojections in von Neumann algebras, factors of type I. They formulated the same result as Theorem 3.1 but with reference in their proof to unpublished paper.

As a simple corollary of Theorem 3.1, we find that self-adjoint operator can be decomposed into an integral combination of 5 orthoprojections (the fact that was prove in [2][Theorem 1(3b)] also), and into a real combination of 5 orthoprojections with infinite dimensional kernel and range.

In section 4 we give a class of operators for which there is no decompositions into a linear combinations of 3 orthoprojections. It appears that these are the operators of the form $I + K$, where I is the identity operator and K is an infinite-rank compact negative or positive operator.

It directly follows from our result that every bounded operator is a complex linear combination of 8 orthoprojections. We can not show that such a number is minimal. Instead of this we give in Corollary 4.4 an example of operator which is not a complex linear combination 4 orthoprojections.

At the end of the paper we consider finite-dimensional unitary space. For a Hermitian $n \times n$ matrix A, Y. Nakamura [13] proved that A is a linear combination of 4 orthoprojections, and it is a linear combination of 3 orthoprojections for $n \leq 7$. Using ideas from infinite dimensional case, we find $m \times m$ matrices B_m, $m \geq 76$, a small norm perturbation of a scalar matrix, such that B_m can not be presented as a linear combinations of 3 orthoprojection.

Throughout the paper $X \approx Y$ means that X is similar to Y and $\operatorname{diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ means a *diagonal* or *block diagonal* matrix with diagonal elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ from $\mathbb{C}$ or from algebra of bounded operator on a Hilbert space H. We denote by $\operatorname{tr} A$ the *trace* of A and by $\sigma(A)$ its *spectrum*. All eigenvalues $\lambda_1(A), \ldots, \lambda_n(A)$ counting multiplicity of a Hermitian $n \times n$ matrix A will supposed to be arranged in increasing order, $\lambda_1(A) \leq \lambda_2(A) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n(A)$. Also we set $\mathbf{0}_n = \operatorname{diag}(0, 0, \ldots, 0)$, and $I_n = \operatorname{diag}(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$. Identity operator on H will be denoted by I or I_H and zero operator — by 0_H.

2 Preliminaries

Before we start with linear combinations of 4 orthoprojections, we remind some facts on linear combinations of two orthoprojections. Suppose P_1 and P_2 are orthoprojections on a Hilbert space H. If $v \in H$ is an eigenvector of both P_1 and P_2, then for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, it is an eigenvector of the operator $A = aP_1 + bP_2$ with eigenvalue $\lambda \in \{0, a, b, a+b\}$. It follows from [6], that the inverse statement is also true, that is for $\mu \in \{0, a, b, a + b\}$ and $h \in H$, the equality $Ah = \mu h$ yields h is an eigenvector of both operators P_1 and P_2. Also every point x from $\sigma(A)$ lies in the union of two segments $[0, a]$ and $[b, a + b]$ for $|b| \geq |a|$:

$$x \in [0, a] \cup [b, a + b] \tag{1}$$

The following Proposition is a direct corollary of [14][Th.1, Corollary 3].

Proposition 2.1. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, P_1, P_2 be orthoprojections on H. Then for every $x \notin \{0, a, b, a + b\}$ the following implications hold*

$$x \in \sigma(aP_1 + bP_2) \Longleftrightarrow (a + b - x) \in \sigma(aP_1 + bP_2).$$

Beside this, both x and $a+b-x$ have the same multiplicity as eigenvalues of aP_1+bP_2 or both are the approximate points of $\sigma(aP_1+bP_2)$.

A simple application of Proposition 2.1 leads to operator inequalities for linear combinations of two orthoprojections.

Corollary 2.2. *Suppose there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $aP_1+bP_2 \le cI$. Then $(a+b-c)P_{\tilde{H}} \le aP_1+bP_2$, where $P_{\tilde{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection on the subspace $\tilde{H} = \overline{\operatorname{Im} P_1 + \operatorname{Im} P_2}$.*

By induction the statement of Corollary 2.2 can be simply expanded to the following proposition on operator inequalities (see more discussion in [18, 3]).

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\alpha_i > 0$, P_i be an orthogonal projection in a Hilbert space H for every $i = 1, \dots k$, $k \ge 2$. Suppose there exist $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the following inequality holds: $\alpha_1 P_1 + \dots + \alpha_k P_k \le cI$. Then*

$$(\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k - (k-1)c)P_{\tilde{H}} \le \alpha_1 P_1 + \dots + \alpha_k P_k,$$

where $P_{\tilde{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection on the subspace $\tilde{H} = \overline{\operatorname{Im} P_1 + \dots + \operatorname{Im} P_k}$.

For self-adjoint A, we shall denote by $\sigma_{ess}(A)$ the Weyl's essential spectrum of A, that is the set

$$\bigcap_{K \in \mathcal{K}} \sigma(A+K)$$

where $\mathcal{K}$ is the set of all Hermitian compact operators. It consists of all limit points of $\sigma(A)$ and all eigenvalues of A of infinite multiplicity.

Corollary 2.4. *In the setting of Proposition 2.1 the following implications hold*

$$x \in \sigma_{ess}(aP_1+bP_2) \Longleftrightarrow (a+b-x) \in \sigma_{ess}(aP_1+bP_2).$$

For more general results on combinations of orthoprojections we refer the reader to nice surveys [1, 22].

3 Main theorem

In this section we consider direct sums of Hilbert spaces and bounded operators on them. Let $H = V \oplus V$, where V is a separable Hilbert space. We denote by $L(H)$ the algebra of all bounded operators on H. Every operator from $L(H)$ can be viewed as 2×2 block matrix. It is easy to show that for Hermitian operators T_1, $T_2 \in L(V)$ with $\sigma(T_1) \in [0,1]$ and $\sigma(T_2) \in [0,2]$, the operator $\operatorname{diag}(T_1, -T_1)$ is a difference of two orthoprojections and the operator $\operatorname{diag}(T_2, 2I_V - T_2))$ is a sum of two orthoprojections [6]. For example defining orthoprojection Q_1 and Q_2 by the formulas

$$Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} (I_V+T_1)/2 & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{I_V - T_1^2} \\ \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{I_V - T_1^2} & (I_V - T_1)/2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_2 = \begin{pmatrix} (I_V-T_1)/2 & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{I_V - T_1^2} \\ \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{I_V - T_1^2} & (I_V + T_1)/2 \end{pmatrix},$$

we have $Q_1 - Q_2 = \operatorname{diag}(T_1, -T_1)$. Using this results and two facts on self-commutators and linear combination of two orthoprojection, we can prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Every bounded self-adjoint operator on H is a linear combination of 4 orthoprojections.*

Proof. Let A be a self-adjoint operator. There exist two subspaces H_1 and H_2 of H such that $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$, $AH_1 \subset H_1$ and both H_1 and H_2 are isomorphic to H. Without lost of generality we suppose that $H_2 = H_1$. According to this decomposition the operator A has the block diagonal form: $A = \operatorname{diag}(A_1, A_2)$, where A_1 and A_2 are self-adjoint operators in H_1. Let $\lambda \in \sigma_{ess}(A_1 + A_2)$. Every Hermitian operator with 0 in the convex hull of its essential spectrum is a self-commutator [19]. Since $0 \in \sigma_{ess}(A_1 + A_2 - \lambda I)$, there exits an operator X, such that $A_1 + A_2 - \lambda I = [X^*, X] = X^*X - XX^*$. We can suppose that X is invertible and $X^*X > (|\lambda| + 1)I$, because of the invariance property of the commutator: $[X^*, X] = [X^* + tI, X + tI]$, $t \in \mathbb{C}$. Note that X^*X and XX^* are unitary equivalent, so $\operatorname{diag}(X^*X, \lambda I - XX^*)$ is a linear combination of 2 orthoprojections [14], say $aP_1 - bP_2$ with $a, b > \|X^*X\|$ and $a - b = \lambda$. Whence, we have

$$A - aP_1 - bP_2 = \operatorname{diag}(T, -T), \tag{2}$$

with $T = A_1 - X^*X$. Beside this, the operator $\operatorname{diag}(T, -T)$ is a difference $P_3 - P_4$ of two orthoprojections multiplied by $\|T\|$. So for the number $c = \|T\|$,

$$A = aP_1 - bP_2 + cP_3 - cP_2, \tag{3}$$

as required. □

Corollary 3.2. *Every bounded operator on a Hilbert space is a linear combination of 8 orthoprojections.*

We call the orthoprojection P *proper* if $\dim \operatorname{Im} P = \dim \operatorname{Im}(I - P) = \infty$.

Corollary 3.3. *Every bounded self-adjoint operator A on a Hilbert space is a real linear combination of 5 proper orthoprojections.*

Proof. Suppose (3) holds and some of P_i are not proper. By construction, $cP_3 - cP_4 = \operatorname{diag}(T, -T)$. Whence if T is of infinite rank, then both P_3 and P_4 are proper. For T being of finite rank, we have P_3 and P_4 have a common eigenspace V_{34}, $\dim V_{34} = \infty$ of the same eigenvalue $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$. Putting P_{34} to be a proper orthoprojection on a subspace of V_{34} and $\tilde{P}_i = P_i + (-1)^\alpha P_{34}$, $i = 3,\ 4$, we see that $\tilde{P}_3$ and $\tilde{P}_4$ are proper orthoprojections and $\tilde{P}_3 - \tilde{P}_4 = P_3 - P_4$.

Suppose now P_1 is proper and P_2 is not proper. If $\operatorname{rank} P_2 < \infty$ then it is a difference of two commuting orthoprojections and if $\operatorname{rank}(I - P_2) < \infty$ then P_2 is a sum of two commuting orthoprojections. Whence A is a linear combination of 5 proper orthoprojections.

In view of symmetry it remains to consider only the case: both P_1 and P_2 are not proper. Then they should have a common eigenspace V_{12}, $\dim V_{12} = \infty$,

such that $P_i h = \alpha_i h$ for every $h \in V_{12}$, $i = 1,\ 2$ and some $\alpha_1,\ \alpha_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. Putting P_{12} to be a proper orthoprojection on a subspace of V_{12} and $\tilde{P}_i = P_i + (-1)^{\alpha_i} P_{34}$, $i = 3,\ 4$, we see that $\tilde{P}_1$ and $\tilde{P}_2$ are proper orthoprojections and $A - (a\tilde{P}_1 - b\tilde{P}_2 + cP_3 - cP_4) = ((-1)^{\alpha_2} b - (-1)^{\alpha_1} a)P_{12}$. Hence A is a linear combination of 5 proper orthoprojections. □

Remark 3.4. *In the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can take $\lambda = 0$ in case the number 0 is in the convex hull of $\sigma(A_1 + A_2)$ and then put $a = b \in \mathbb{N}$ and set c being integer part of $||T|| + 1$. Thus A is an integral linear combination of 4 orthoprojections for this particular case. In general situation, when $\lambda \in \sigma_{ess}(A_1 + A_2)$ and $\lambda \neq 0$, we can take any proper orthoprojection from $L(H_1)$ and any integer number d satisfied the conditions $|d| > 2\|A\|$ and $\lambda d > 0$. Then we obtain that convex hull of $\sigma_{ess}(A_1 + A_2 - dP_5)$ contains zero. So the operator $A - d \operatorname{diag}(P_5, 0_{H_1})$ is an integral linear combination of 4 orthoprojections and A is an integral linear combination of 5 orthoprojections.*

4 Counterexamples

Not every operator of the form $I + K$, where K is an infinite-rank compact operator is a linear combination of 3 orthoprojections. To prove this we have to show that for P_1 being orthoprojection, the difference $I + K - \alpha_1 P_1$ is not a linear combination of two orthoprojection. Note that for proper P_1 with $\alpha_1 \neq 1$, the spectrum $\sigma_{ess}(I + K - \alpha_1 P_1)$ has exactly two points and if P_1 is not proper, then the corresponding essential spectrum has only one point. So we start with properties of linear combinations of two orthoprojections whose essential spectra contain at most two points.

(i) Let $a \leq b \in \mathbb{R}$, P_1, P_2 be orthoprojections and suppose that $\sigma_{ess}(aP_1 + bP_2) = \{x\}$. Then $x \in \{0, a, b, a + b\}$. Assume that this is not true, i.e. $x \notin \{0, a, b, a + b\}$. Applying Corollary 2.2, we obtain $a + b - x \in \{x\} \Longrightarrow x = (a + b)/2$. In view of (1) this can be true only if $a = b$ or $a + b = 0$. So $x = a$ or $x = 0$. A contradiction.

We note that for a sequence of different numbers $x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots$ with every $x_i \in \sigma(aP_1 + bP_2)$ and $\lim_{i\to\infty} x_i = x$, we have here by Proposition 2.1 that all except may be two elements of the sequence $a + b - x_1, a + b - x_2, \ldots$ must be in $\sigma(aP_1 + bP_2)$ and so the spectrum contains infinite number of points less than x and infinite number of points greater than x.

(ii) Let now $\sigma_{ess}(aP_1 + bP_2) = \{x, y\}$, where $0 < x < y$ and $0 < a \leq b$. Then $x + y = a + b$ or $x \in \{a, b\}$. Indeed, suppose the inverse is true, i.e. $x + y \neq a + b$ and $x \notin \{a, b\}$. Since $x < y$ and $y \in \sigma(aP_1 + bP_2)$, then $x < a + b$. By Corollary 2.2, $a + b - x \in \sigma_{ess}(aP_1 + bP_2)$ and so $a + b - x = x$ or $a + b - x = y$. The last equality is not valid by assumption, hence $x = (a + b)/2 = a$ as in the previous paragraph. A contradiction.

We note that $a+b \neq x+y$ yields also to the equality $y = a+b$ and the number $a+b$ has to be is an isolated point of $\sigma(aP_1+bP_2)$. Indeed, assuming the existence of different $x_i \in \sigma(aP_1 + bP_2)$, $\lim_{i\to\infty} x_i = a+b$, we see $\lim_{i\to\infty}(a+b-x_i) = 0$,

whence by Proposition 2.1, $0 \in \sigma_{ess}(aP_1 + bP_2)$, which is not true by the initial assumption.

We shall use the following result on rank-one perturbation of a Hermitian compact operator [8].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $K = \operatorname{diag}(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \dots)$, where $\mu_1 > \mu_2 > \mu_3 > \dots$, $\mu_n \to 0$, $n \to \infty$. For every rank one orthogonal projection P and every $t > 0$, the set of eigenvalues $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \gamma_3 \geq \dots$ of $K + tP$ satisfy the interlace relation $\gamma_1 \geq \mu_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \mu_2 \geq \gamma_3 \geq \dots$*

We note that for $t < 0$ the interlace property in the proposition is also true but in the inverse order: $\dots, \gamma_3 \leq \mu_3 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \mu_2 \leq \gamma_1 \leq \mu_1$, see also more discussion in [21].

Proposition 4.2. *Let K be non-negative compact operator of infinite rank. Then $I - K$ is not a linear combination of three orthoprojections.*

Proof. The main goal in the proof is to find a relation between coefficients in a decomposition of $I - K$ into a linear combination of 3 orthoprojections if such a decomposition exists. And then prove that with such a relation the decomposition do not exist. Let us split a proof into several parts.

1. We assume $I - K = \beta_1 Q_1 + \beta_2 Q_2 + \beta_3 Q_1$, where $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ and Q_1, Q_2 and Q_3 are orthoprojections. If some of the coefficients, say β_1 and β_2, are negative, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} I - K =& \beta_1 Q_1 + \beta_2 Q_2 + \beta_3 Q_1 \iff \\ (1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) I - K =& (-\beta_1)(I - Q_1) + (-\beta_2)(I - Q_2) + \beta_3 Q_1. \end{aligned}$$

So $(1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2)I - K$ is a linear combination of 3 orthoprojections with positive coefficients. Putting $\tilde{K} = K/(1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2)$, we conclude that there exists decomposition

$$I - \tilde{K} = \alpha_1 P_1 + \alpha_2 P_2 + \alpha_3 P_3,$$

where P_1, P_2, P_3 are orthoprojections, $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_3 \leq 1$ and $\tilde{K} \geq 0$ is a compact self-adjoint operator of infinite rank. We denote $B_{ij} = \alpha_i P_i + \alpha_j P_j$ for $i \neq j$. The coefficient $\alpha_1 > 0$ or otherwise $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $I - \tilde{K} = B_{23}$ is a linear combination of two orthoprojection. Immediately we have $\sigma_{ess}(B_{23}) = \{1\}$. This is the case (i) above with $x = 1$. But 1 is an approximate point of $\sigma(B_{23})$ and all but one points of $\sigma(B_{23})$ is less then 1 by definition. So $I - \tilde{K}$ can not be a linear combination of two orthoprojections. Whence $\alpha_1 > 0$.

The coefficient $\alpha_3 < 1$. Indeed, if $\alpha_3 = 1$, then $B_{12} = (I - P_3) - \tilde{K} \geq 0$. Whence $\ker(I - P_3) \subset \ker \tilde{K}$. Considering restrictions of P_1 and P_2 onto $\tilde{H} = Im(I - P_3)$, we see that restriction $B_{12}\,|_{\tilde{H}}$ is a linear combination of two orthoprojections and at the same time $B_{12}\,|_{\tilde{H}} = I_{\tilde{H}} - \tilde{K}\,|_{\tilde{H}}$ with $\tilde{K}\,|_{\tilde{H}}$ of infinite rank. So we come to a contradiction as in the case $\alpha_1 = 0$ above.

2. Now we can prove that every P_i is proper, $i = 1, 2, 3$. For example, if P_1 is of finite rank, then $-\tilde{K} - \alpha_1 P_1$ is non-positive compact operator of infinite rank.

So $B_{23} = I-(\tilde{K}+\alpha_1 P_1)$ can not be a linear combination of two orthoprojections (see the explanation of the case $\alpha_1 = 0$).

If $I - P_1$ is of finite rank, then $B_{23} = (1 - \alpha_1)I + \alpha_1(I - P_1) - \tilde{K}$. Hence $\sigma_{ess}(B_{23}) = \{1 - \alpha_1\}$ and the compact operator $\alpha_1(I - P) - \tilde{K}$ is finite dimensional perturbation of non-positive operator $-\tilde{K}$. So it has finite number of positive eigenvalues and infinite number of negative eigenvalues. This means $1-\alpha_1$ is an approximate point of $\sigma(B_{23})$ by infinite different numbers less than $1-\alpha_1$ and there are only finite numbers from $\sigma(B_{23})$ greater than $1-\alpha_1$. Hence B_{23} can not be a linear combination of 2 orthoprojections or P_1 has to be proper. In view of symmetry, P_i is proper for every $i = 1, 2, 3$.

3. Let us consider $\sigma_{ess}(B_{23})$ more closely. The operator $I - \alpha_1 P_1$ has two points of infinite multiplicity in its spectrum, 1 and $1 - \alpha_1$, so $\sigma_{ess}(B_{23}) = \{1, 1-\alpha_1\}$. There are only two possible values for the sum $\alpha_2+\alpha_3$: $\alpha_2+\alpha_3 = 1$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 2 - \alpha_1$. We consider these cases separately.

Let $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 1$, i.e. 1 is an isolated point of $\sigma(B_{23})$. We define $H_{23} = (\operatorname{Im} P_2 \cap \operatorname{Im} P_3)^{\perp}$. For every $h \in H_{23}^{\perp}$, $P_2 h = P_3 h = h \Longrightarrow (\alpha_2 P_2 + \alpha_3 P_3)h = h$. Also $((I - \tilde{K})x, x) \le \|x\|^2$ for every $x \in H$. On the other hand, $((I - \tilde{K})h, h) = (\alpha_1 P_1 + \alpha_2 P_2 + \alpha_3 P_3 h, h) = \alpha_1(P_1 h, h) + \|h\|^2$. This yields $P_1 h = 0$. So $H_{23}^{\perp} \in \operatorname{Ker} P_1$ and $H_{23}^{\perp} \in \operatorname{Ker} \tilde{K}$. Therefore we can restrict every operator P_1, P_2, P_3 and $\tilde{K}$ to H_{23}, obtaining the decomposition $\hat{I} - \hat{K} = \alpha_1 \hat{P}_1 + \alpha_2 \hat{P}_2 + \alpha_3 \hat{P}_3$ on Hilbert space H_{23}. In this decomposition $\hat{K}$ is obviously of infinite rank but the orthoprojections $\hat{P}_1$, $\hat{P}_2$ and $\hat{P}_3$ might not be proper. We repeat the same argument from the part 2 of the proof and so we can assume without lost of generality that every $\hat{P}_i$ is proper, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Again $\alpha_2 \hat{P}_2 + \alpha_3 \hat{P}_3 = (\hat{I} - \alpha_1 \hat{P}_1) - \hat{K}$, hence 1 must be in $\sigma_{ess}(\alpha_2 \hat{P}_2 + \alpha_3 \hat{P}_3)$ but by construction $1 \notin \sigma(\alpha_2 \hat{P}_2 + \alpha_3 \hat{P}_3)$. Therefore $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \ne 1$.

4. The remaining case is $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 2$. We remind that $\alpha_j < 1$ and $\alpha_i \le \alpha_{i+1}$, hence $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \ge 4/3$. In view of Corollary 2.2 from the inequality $B_{23} \le I$, we have $(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1)P_{\operatorname{Im} P_2 + \operatorname{Im} P_3} \le B_{23}$, that is $x \in \sigma(B_{23}) \Longrightarrow x = 0$ or $x \ge \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$. So 0 is an isolated point of B_{23}.

Let $\tilde{K}$ be a diagonal operator diag $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \dots)$ in some orthogonal base of H and $\gamma_i \ge \gamma_{i+1}$, $i \ge 1$. There exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such $\gamma_{k+1} < 1 - \alpha_1$. Since the operator $I - \alpha_1 P_1 \ge (1-\alpha_1)I$, the operator $I - \alpha_1 P_1 - \operatorname{diag}(0_k, \gamma_{k+1}, \gamma_{k+2}, \dots)$ is invertible. Hence dimension n of the kernel of B_{23} is at most k. Let $V_{23} = (\operatorname{Ker} B_{23})^{\perp}$. We define $\check{P}_1$ as a rank n orthoprojection onto a subspace of $\operatorname{Im} P_1$ with the following property: $(P_1 - \check{P}_1)h = 0$ for every $h \in V_{23}^{\perp}$. Putting $\check{K} = \tilde{K} + \alpha_1 \check{P}_1$, we have

$$I - \check{K} = \alpha_1(P_1 - \check{P}_1) + \alpha_2 P_2 + \alpha_3 P_3.$$

By construction, every operator $P_1 - \check{P}_1$, P_2 and P_3 maps $V_{23}^{\perp}$ into zero vector. Hence $V_{23}^{\perp}$ is invariant under the act of these operators and so is $\check{K}$. As in the previous part we consider the restriction of the operators to the subspace V_{23} marking corresponding operators with breve: $\breve{I} - \breve{K} = \alpha_1 \breve{P}_1 + \alpha_2 \breve{P}_2 + \alpha_3 \breve{P}_3$. Since here $\alpha_2 \breve{P}_2 + \alpha_3 \breve{P}_3$ is invertible, we have $\breve{I} - \breve{K} - \alpha_1 \breve{P}_1$ is invertible. On

the other hand,

$$\alpha_2\breve{P}_2 + \alpha_3\breve{P}_3 \geq (\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1)\breve{I} = (1 - \alpha_1)\breve{I}. \tag{4}$$

Also, according to the decomposition of V_{23} into a direct sum,

$$V_{23} = H_1 \oplus H_2, \quad H_2 = \operatorname{Im}\breve{P}_1, \tag{5}$$

the operator $\breve{I} - \alpha_1\breve{P}_1$ has the diagonal form $\operatorname{diag}(I_{H_1}, (1-\alpha_1)I_{H_2})$. The inequality (4) implies $\breve{I} - \breve{K} - \alpha_1\breve{P}_1 \geq (1-\alpha_1)\breve{I}$, whence $\breve{K}H_2 = 0$ and so $\breve{K} = \operatorname{diag}(K', 0_{H_2})$ subject to the decomposition (5). As a corollary we have that 1 is an approximated point of $\sigma(\alpha_2\breve{P}_2 + \alpha_3\breve{P}_3)$ and this point is greater than α_3 and less than $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3$ and at the same time $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1 = 1 - \alpha_1$ is an isolated point of $\sigma(\alpha_2\breve{P}_2 + \alpha_3\breve{P}_3)$. Therefore $\breve{I} - \breve{K} - \alpha_1\breve{P}_1$ can not be a linear combination of two orthoprojections and this complete the proof of the part. □

Corollary 4.3. *Let K be non-negative compact operator of infinite rank. Then $I + K$ is not a linear combination of three orthoprojections.*

Proof. Suppose $I + K = \beta_1 Q_1 + \beta_2 Q_2 + \beta_3 Q_3$, where for every $i = 1, 2, 3$, Q_i is an orthoprojection. Replacing Q_i with $I - Q_i$ when $\beta_i < 0$, we can find new decomposition $I + cK = \alpha_1 P_1 + \alpha_2 P_2 + \alpha_3 P_3$ with $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and some positive c. The equivalent decomposition is

$$(\sum_{i=1}^{3}\alpha_i - 1)I - cK = \sum_{i=1}^{3}\alpha_i(I - P_i). \tag{6}$$

Since $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \geq \|I + cK\| > 1$, the decomposition (6) states that scalar operator minus compact operator is a linear combination of 3 orthoprojections, which contradicts Proposition 4.2. This completes the proof. □

We denote by $\boldsymbol{i}$ the imaginary unit $\sqrt{-1}$ in $\mathbb{C}$, by $Re(x)$ and $Im(x)$ corresponding real and imaginary parts of a complex number x.

Corollary 4.4. *The operator of the form $I - K - \boldsymbol{i}K$ is not a complex linear combination of 4 orthoprojections.*

Proof. Suppose the inverse and $I - K - \boldsymbol{i}K = c_1P_1 + c_2P_2 + c_3P_3 + c_4P_4$. Then

$$I - K = Re(c_1)P_1 + Re(c_2)P_2 + Re(c_3)P_3 + Re(c_4)P_4 \tag{7}$$

and

$$-K = Im(c_1)P_1 + Im(c_2)P_2 + Im(c_3)P_3 + Im(c_4)P_4. \tag{8}$$

By Proposition 4.2, every $Re(c_i) \neq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, 4$. Also

$$-K - \sum_{Im(c_j)<0} Im(c_j)I = \sum_{1}^{4}|Im(c_i)|\,Q_i, \quad Q_i = \begin{cases} P_i & \text{if } Im(c_i) \geq 0, \\ I - P_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus for every $i = 1, \dots, 4$, $Im(c_i) \neq 0$ either. There exists k, such that $Re(c_k) \neq Im(c_k)$, because $I - K \neq -K$. Evaluating $I - K - Re(c_k)/Im(c_k)K$ by (7) and (8), we have that this operator is a real linear combination of orthoprojections P_i, $i = 1, \dots, 4$, $i \neq k$, which is not true by Proposition 4.2 or by Corollary 4.3. Therefore $I - K - \boldsymbol{i}K$ is not a linear combination of 4 orthoprojections. □

Now we turn our attention to finite matrices. Impossibility to decompose $I - K$ into a linear combination of 3 orthoprojections from Proposition 4.2 suggests the form of a matrix for which such a decomposition does not exist either. Before we start we recall that the interlace property from Proposition 2 is also true for Hermitian matrices. Following [9] we denote by $\lambda_k(A)$ the k-th smallest eigenvalue of the Hermitian matrix A counting multiplicity. We shall use well known Weyl's theorem on rank k perturbation of spectrum of a Hermitian matrix (see [9, Theorem 4.3.6])

Theorem 4.5. *Let A and B be Hermitian $n \times m$ matrices and* $\operatorname{rank} B \leq k$. *Then $\lambda_j(A + B) \leq \lambda_{j+k}(A) \leq \lambda_{j+2k}(A + B)$, $j = 1, \dots, n - 2k$.*

Also we shall frequently use the monotonicity property for eigenvalues of Hermitian $n \times n$ matrices: $A \leq B \Longrightarrow \lambda_i(A) \leq \lambda_i(B)$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $A = \operatorname{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_4, \gamma_1 I_{18}, \dots, \gamma_4 I_{18})$, where $\mu_i = (1 - 10^{-10i}\theta)$, $\gamma_i = (1 + 10^{100(i-5)}\theta)$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$, $0 < \theta \leq 1$. Then A is not a real linear combination of three orthoprojections.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. The matrix A is not a linear combination of two orthoprojection by Proposition 2.1. So suppose A is a linear combination of 3 orthprojections, say $A = \alpha_1 P_1 + \alpha_2 P_2 + \alpha_3 P_3$. Let n be the size of A, $n = 76$. If one of the coefficients α_1, α_2, α_3 is negative, then using the procedure from the first part of the proof of Proposition 4.2, we come to a new matrix A_1 and the decomposition with positive coefficients,

$$A_1 = \frac{A + cI_n}{1 + c} = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{|\alpha_i|}{1 + c} \tilde{P}_i,$$

where $c = (|\alpha_1| + |\alpha_2| + |\alpha_3| - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3)/2$. Note that in this case eigenvalues of A_1 can be calculated by formulas for eigenvalues of A in the formulation of Proposition 4.6 but with smaller value of parameter θ, which should be equal $\theta/(1+c)$. We will not specify the parameter θ and so, without lost of generality, we may assume that every α_i is positive, $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_3 \leq \gamma_4$. We denote $\epsilon = 1 - \mu_1$, $\delta = \gamma_1 - 1$, $B_{ij} = \alpha_i P_i + \alpha_j P_j$ and $H_{ij} := \operatorname{Im} B_{ij}$.

Let us show that $9 \leq \operatorname{rank} P_i \leq n - 9$ for every $i = 1, 2, 3$. It's enough to establish this for P_1. At first, suppose $k_1 = \operatorname{rank} P_1 < 9$. Since B_{23} is a rank k_1 perturbation of A, we have that every eigenvalue of B_{23} which does not coincide with $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$ has multiplicity at most $k_1 + 1 \leq 9$ and every γ_i has multiplicity at least $18 - k_1 \geq 10$. Since B_{23} is a linear combination of 2 orthoprojections, then by Proposition 2.1, γ_1 coincides with one of the numbers α_2, α_3 and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3$

or the number $\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\gamma_1$ is an eigenvalue of B_{23} of the same multiplicity as γ_1 and so it coincides with γ_j for some $j=1,\dots,4$. The same is true for γ_2, γ_3 and γ_4. Therefore, there exist i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4 such that $\{i_1,i_2\}\neq\{i_3,i_4\}$ and

$$\gamma_{i_1}+\gamma_{i_2}=\alpha_2+\alpha_3=\gamma_{i_3}+\gamma_{i_4}. \tag{9}$$

In view of definition of γ_i, the property (9) does not hold for any different sets $\{i_1,i_2\}$ and $\{i_3,i_4\}$. So $\operatorname{rank}P_1\geq 9$.

Suppose now that $\operatorname{rank}P_1>n-9$. Then $B_{23}=(A-I)+(I-P_1)$ and hence B_{23} is a rank $n-k_1$ perturbation of $A-I$ with $n-k_1<9$. The same reason as above shows $\gamma_{i_1}+\gamma_{i_2}=\gamma_{i_3}+\gamma_{i_4}$, which is not true by definition. So $\operatorname{rank}P_1\leq n-9$. In view of symmetry $9\leq\operatorname{rank}P_i\leq n-9$ for every $i=1,2,3$.

Thus $9\leq k_1\leq n-9$. By Theorem 4.5 for the matrix B_{23} and α_1P_1, we have $\gamma_1=\lambda_5(A)\leq\lambda_{k_1+5}(B_{23})$. We fix some $p\in\mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda_p(B_{23})\geq\gamma_1$ and define $x^*=\lambda_p(B_{23})$. Since B_{23} is a linear combination of 2 orthoprojections, there exist only four possible cases for x^*:

$$\begin{aligned}&1)\ x^*=\alpha_2,\quad 2)\ x^*=\alpha_3,\quad 3)\ x^*=\alpha_2+\alpha_3,\\ &4)\ x^*\notin\{\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\alpha_2+\alpha_3\},\quad \alpha_2+\alpha_3-x^*\in\sigma(B_{23}).\end{aligned}$$

We consider all cases separately.

Case 1) $x^*=\alpha_2$. We use only the fact that $\alpha_2\geq\gamma_1$. Due to ordering, $\alpha_3\geq\alpha_2\geq\gamma_1$. Applying Corollary 2.2 to inequalities $B_{23}\leq A\leq\gamma_4 I$, we get

$$(\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\gamma_4)P_{H_{23}}\leq\alpha_2P_2+\alpha_3P_3. \tag{10}$$

So all nonzero eigenvalues of B_{23} is greater or equal to $\alpha_2+\alpha_3-\gamma_4\geq 2\gamma_1-\gamma_4>\mu_4$. Since $B_{23}\leq A$, we have by monotonicity principle, $\lambda_4(B_{23})\leq\mu_4$. In view of (10), we obtain that $\lambda_1(B_{23})=\dots=\lambda_4(B_{23})=0$. On the other hand, $\alpha_1P_1+B_{23}=A$, so $\alpha_1\geq\mu_4$. Applying now Proposition 2.3 to the linear combination $\alpha_1P_1+\alpha_2P_2+\alpha_3P_3$, we conclude

$$A\geq(\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3-2\gamma_4)I\geq(2\gamma_1+\mu_4-2\gamma_4)I>\mu_3 I, \tag{11}$$

that is $\mu_3\notin\sigma(A)$ which is not true by definition of A. Therefore $\alpha_2<\gamma_1$ and so $x^*\neq\alpha_2$.

Case 2) $x^*=\alpha_3$. Here we consider $B_{12}=A-\alpha_3P_3$. Since $\operatorname{rank}P_3\leq n-9$, then by Theorem 4.5 we have $\lambda_n(B_{12})\geq\lambda_9(A)=\gamma_1$. So $\alpha_1+\alpha_2\geq\gamma_1$ and $\alpha_2\geq\gamma_1/2$. Putting $\triangle=\gamma_4-\gamma_1$ and substituting γ_1 for α_3 in (10), we obtain

$$B_{23}\geq(\alpha_2-\triangle)P_{H_{23}}. \tag{12}$$

If in addition $P_{H_{23}}\neq I$, then B_{23} is singular and so $B_{23}+\alpha_1 I$ has an eigenvalue α_1. With the property $A\leq B_{23}+\alpha_1 I$ this implies by monotonicity property that $\alpha_1\geq\mu_1$ and so automatically $\alpha_2\geq\mu_1$. In view of (12) and $B_{23}+\alpha_1P_1\leq A$, we conclude $\operatorname{Im}P_1\cap H_{23}=\emptyset$. So $\dim\ker(B_{23})=\operatorname{rank}P_1\geq 9$. Hence $B_{23}+\alpha_1 I$ has the eigenvalue α_1 of multiplicity at least 9 that is $\alpha_1=\lambda_9(B_{23}+\alpha_1 I)\geq$

$\lambda_9(A) = \gamma_1$. As a corollary we obtain $\alpha_2 \geq \gamma_1$ and this is case 1) which was considered above.

Thus, $P_{H_{23}} = I$. It follows immediately from (12) that $(\alpha_2 - \triangle)I + \alpha_1 P_1 \leq A$. So $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \triangle \leq \gamma_4$. We mentioned in Preliminaries that the spectrum of a linear combination $\alpha_2 P_2 + \alpha_3 P_3$ of orthoprojections lies in the union of two segments: $[0, \alpha_2] \cup [\alpha_3, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3]$. Hence by (12), we have $\sigma(B_{23}) \cap [0, \alpha_2] \subset [\alpha_2 - \triangle, \alpha_2]$. This yields from Proposition 2.1, that $\sigma(B_{23}) \cap (\alpha_2, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3] \subset [\alpha_3, \alpha_3 + \triangle]$. Hence $B_{23} = \alpha_3(I - Q) + \alpha_2 Q + B_\triangle$, where Q is some orthogonal projection and $B_\triangle$ is a Hermitian matrix with $\|B_\triangle\| \leq \triangle$. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 P_1 + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_2)Q = \alpha_1 P_1 + \alpha_3 Q + \alpha_2(I - Q) - \alpha_2 I \leq \alpha_1 P_1 \\ + B_{23} - \alpha_2 I + \triangle I \leq (\gamma_5 - \alpha_2 + \triangle)I \leq (\alpha_3 - \alpha_2 + 2\triangle)I. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

By Corollary 2.2 for linear combination of orthoprojections P_1 and Q, we have

$$(\alpha_1 - 2\triangle)P_{H_1} \leq \alpha_1 P_1 + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_2)Q, \tag{14}$$

where $H_1 = \operatorname{Im} P_1 + \operatorname{Im} Q$. As we showed above, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \geq \gamma_1$ and $\gamma_1 \leq \alpha_3 \leq \gamma_4$. Hence $\alpha_1 \geq \gamma_1 - \alpha_2 \geq \alpha_3 - (\gamma_4 - \gamma_1) - \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 - \alpha_2 - \triangle$. Combining (13) and (14), we obtain

$$(\alpha_3 - \alpha_2 - 3\triangle)P_{H_1} \leq \alpha_1 P_1 + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_2)Q \leq (\alpha_3 - \alpha_2 + 2\triangle)I, \tag{15}$$

that is $\sigma(\alpha_1 P_1 + (\alpha_2 - \alpha_3)Q) \in \{0, [\alpha_3 - \alpha_2 - 3\triangle, \alpha_3 - \alpha_2 + 2\triangle]\}$. By construction, $A = \alpha_1 P_1 + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_2)Q + \alpha_2 I + B_\triangle$. So the spectrum of A must be in $4\triangle$ neighborhoods of the following three points 0, α_2 and α_3. By conditions of the Proposition, the eigenvalues μ_i of A satisfies the inequalities $|\mu_i - \mu_j| > 8\triangle$ for $i \neq j$. So $\sigma(A)$ contains a point that is not from the mentioned neighborhoods and therefore $x^* \neq \alpha_3$.

Case 3) $x^* = \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$. We note that in this case $\alpha_3 \geq x^*/2$ and $\alpha_2 \leq x^*/2$. Hence $\alpha_1 \leq x^*/2$. It follows then

$$B_{23} = A - \alpha_1 P_1 \geq \mu_1 I - \alpha_1 I \geq (\mu_1 - x^*/2)I, \tag{16}$$

i.e. B_{23} is invertible. On the other hand, $B_{23} \leq \alpha_3 P_3 + \alpha_2 I$ and the last matrix has at least five pairwise orthogonal eigenvectors with eigenvalue α_2 since $\operatorname{rank} P_3 \leq n - 9$. This means $\lambda_5(B_{23}) \leq \alpha_2$. Let H_μ be four dimensional subspace containing eigenvectors of A corresponding the eigenvalues μ_1, μ_3, μ_3 and μ_4. Applying Courant-Fischer min-max theorem for the eigenvalue $\lambda_5(B_{23})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2 \geq \lambda_5(B_{23}) \geq \min_{\|x\|=1, x \perp H_\mu} (B_{23}v, v) \\ \geq \min_{\|v\|=1, v \perp H_\mu} (Av, v) - \max_{\|v\|=1, v \perp H_\mu} (\alpha_1 P_1 v, v) = \gamma_1 - \alpha_1, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where (v, w) means the inner product of corresponding vectors. So $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \geq \gamma_1$. Also $\gamma_4 \geq x^* = \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \geq 2\alpha_2 \geq \alpha_2 + \alpha_1$. Combining these two inequalities, we obtain estimations on α_1, α_2 and α_3:

- $\gamma_1/2 \le \alpha_2 \le \gamma_5/2$,
- $\gamma_1/2 \le \alpha_3 \le \gamma_5 - \gamma_1/2 = \gamma_5/2 + \triangle/2$,
- $\gamma_1/2 - \triangle/2 = \gamma_1 - \gamma_5/2 \le \alpha_1 \le \gamma_5/2$.

Thus the numbers α_1, α_2 and α_3 are in $\triangle$ neighborhood of $1/2$. Using Proposition 2.1 and (16) to $\alpha_2 P_2 + \alpha_3 P_3$, we get

$$\sigma(B_{23}) \subset \{[\mu_1 - x^*/2, \alpha_2+\alpha_3-\mu_1+x^*/2], \alpha_2+\alpha_3\} \subset \{[0.4, 0.6], \alpha_2+\alpha_3\}. \quad (18)$$

Let $H_2 = \operatorname{Im} P_2 \cap \operatorname{Im} P_3$, the eigensubspace of B_{23} corresponding the eigenvalue $\alpha_2+\alpha_3$. Since $\mu_1 I \le A \le \gamma_5 I$, then $\mu_1 I - \alpha_1 P_1 \le A - \alpha_1 P_1 \le \gamma_4 I - \alpha_1 P_1$. Using monotonicity property, we conclude that$A - \alpha_1 P_1$ has at least k_1 eigenvalues which are not greater than $\gamma_4 - \alpha_1$ and at least $n - k_1$ eigenvalues which are greater or equal μ_1. So $\lambda_{k_1}(B_{23}) \le \mu_1 \le \lambda_{k_1+1}(B_{23})$. In view of (18), we have $\lambda_{k_1+1}(B_{23}) = \cdots = \lambda_n(B_{23})$ and $\dim H_2 = n - k_1$. We remind that B_{23} is invertible. So $\operatorname{rank} P_2 + \operatorname{rank} P_3 = n + \dim H_2 = 2n - k_1$. Let us estimate the trace of A:

$$trA = \sum_1^n \lambda_i(A) \le (n-4)\gamma_4 + \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3 + \mu_4 \le n\gamma_4 - (\gamma_4 - \mu_1). \quad (19)$$

Also,

$$trA = \sum_1^3 \operatorname{tr}(\alpha_i P_i) = \sum_1^3 \alpha_i \operatorname{rank} P_i \ge \alpha_1 \sum_1^3 \operatorname{rank} P_i = 2n\alpha_1 \ge n(\gamma_1 - \triangle). \quad (20)$$

Subtracting (20) from (19), we get

$$(n\gamma_5 - (\gamma_5 - \mu_1)) - n(\gamma_1 - \triangle) = (n+1)\triangle - (\gamma_5 - \mu_1) \ge 0.$$

This inequality is not valid by conditions of the Proposition. Therefore $x^* \ne \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$.

Before we start with case 4) we remark that according to the proof of the cases 1)–3) the number x^* can not belong to $\{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3\}$ for every p. So without lost of generality we assume that every eigenvalue λ of B_{23} does not belong $\{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3\}$ as soon as it is greater or equal γ_1. Also in case 1) we prove more strong statement that in all possible decompositions of A into a linear combination of 3 orthoprojection with positive coefficients, the value of α_2 has to be less than γ_1.

Case 4) $x^* \notin \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3\}$, $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - x^* \in \sigma(B_{23})$. We define $x_i = \lambda_{n-5+i}(B_{23})$, $i = 1, \ldots, 5$. Since $\operatorname{rank} P_1 \le n - 9$, then $\lambda_{n-4}(B_{23}) \ge \gamma_1$. So due to assumption, $x_i \notin \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3\}$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - x_i \in \sigma(B_{23})$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, 5$. Also $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - x_1 \ge \cdots \ge \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - x_5$, whence $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - x_1 \ge \lambda_5(B_{23})$.

From inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} A - \alpha_1 P_1 &\ge \operatorname{diag}(0_4, \gamma_1 I_{n-4}) - \alpha_1 P_1 = \gamma_1 I_n - \alpha_1 P_1 - \operatorname{diag}(\gamma_1 I_4, 0_{n-4}) \\ &\ge (\gamma_1 - \alpha_1) I_n - \operatorname{diag}(\gamma_1 I_4, 0_{n-4}) = \operatorname{diag}(-\alpha_1 I_4, (\gamma_1 - \alpha_1) I_{n-4}). \end{aligned}$$

we have $\lambda_5(B_{23}) \geq \gamma_1 - \alpha_1 > 0$. Now we can estimate α_i: $x_1 \geq \gamma_1$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - x_1 \geq \gamma_1 - \alpha_1 \Longrightarrow \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \geq 2\gamma_1$. On the other hand, $A \leq \gamma_4 I$, so $B_{23} \leq \gamma_4 I - \alpha_1 P_1$. By monotonicy property $\lambda_5(B_{23}) \leq \lambda_5(\gamma_4 I - \alpha_1 P_1) = \gamma_4 - \alpha_1$. The eigenvalue x_5 is the biggest eigenvalue of B_{23}. By Proposition 2.1, $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - x_5$ is the smallest positive eigenvalue of B_{23}, that is $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - x_5 \leq \lambda_5(B_{23}) \leq \gamma_4 - \alpha_1$. Taking into account $x_5 \leq \gamma_4$, we obtain:

$$2\gamma_1 \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \leq 2\gamma_4. \tag{21}$$

Since $\alpha_1 > 0$ and it is minimal element of $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$, we get $\alpha_1 \leq 2\gamma_4/3 \approx 2/3$. So B_{23} is invertible and by Proposition 4.1,

$$(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \gamma_4)I \leq B_{23}. \tag{22}$$

In addition to this the inequality $\lambda_1(B_{23}) \leq \lambda_1(A) = \mu_1$ implies $\mu_1 \geq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \gamma_4$, i.e. applying left part of inequalities (21), $\mu_1 \geq \gamma_1 - \alpha_1 + (\gamma_1 - \gamma_4)$. Thus,

$$\alpha_1 \geq (\gamma_1 - \mu_1) + (\gamma_1 - \gamma_4) \geq \epsilon - \triangle \tag{23}$$

and due to right part of inequalities (21), we have

$$\alpha_2 \leq \gamma_4 - \alpha_1/2 \leq \gamma_4 - \epsilon/2 + \triangle \leq \mu_2 - 10\triangle. \tag{24}$$

We are going to localize eigenvalues of B_{23} more accurately in order to use the same idea as in the case 2).

Let

$$K_1 = \operatorname{diag}(0_4, 0_{18}, (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)I_{18}, (\gamma_3 - \gamma_1)I_{18}, (\gamma_4 - \gamma_1)I_{18})$$

and

$$K_2 = \operatorname{diag}(\mu_1 - \gamma_1, \mu_2 - \gamma_1, \mu_3 - \gamma_1, \mu_4 - \gamma_1, 0_{n-4},)$$

Then $A = \gamma_1 I + K_1 + K_2$. Note that $\|K_1\| \leq \triangle$ and $\|K_2\| \leq \epsilon + \delta$. Also $K_1 \geq 0$ and $K_2 \leq 0$. Let $\hat{B}_1 = \gamma_1 I + K_1 - \alpha_1 P_1$ and $\hat{B}_2 = \gamma_1 I + K_2 - \alpha_1 P_1$. Counting multiplicity, the spectrum of $\hat{B}_1$ has at least k_1 points that are less or equal $\gamma_1 - \alpha_1 + \triangle$. Since $B_{23} \leq \hat{B}_1$, we have $\lambda_{k_1}(B_{23}) \leq \gamma_1 - \alpha_1 + \triangle$. Also Theorem 4.5 for the sum $\hat{B}_2 + \alpha_1 P_1$ yields $\mu_2 = \lambda_2(\hat{B}_2 + \alpha_1 P_1) \leq \lambda_{k_1+2}(\hat{B}_2)$. Since $\hat{B}_2 \leq B_{23}$, we get $\mu_2 \leq \lambda_{k_1+2}(B_{23})$. From inequalities (21) we get $\gamma_1 - \alpha_1 - \triangle \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \gamma_4$ and so by (22),

$$\gamma_1 - \alpha_1 - \triangle \leq \lambda_1(B_{23}) \leq \lambda_1(B_{23}) \leq \ldots \lambda_{k_1}(B_{23}) \leq \gamma_1 - \alpha_1 + \triangle. \tag{25}$$

Let us count the number of different eigenvalues of B_{23} in the segment $[\mu_2, 1 - 2\triangle]$. We denote them by $t_1, \ldots, t_s$. The eigenvalue $t_i > \alpha_2$ in view of inequality (24) and $t_i \neq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$ since $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \geq 4/3$. So $t_i = \alpha_3$ or $t_i > \alpha_3$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - t_i \in \sigma(B_{23})$. In the last case we see that

$$\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - t_i < \alpha_2 \leq \gamma_4 - \epsilon/2 + \triangle < \mu_2$$

and

$$\alpha_2+\alpha_3-t_i\geq\alpha_2+\alpha_3-(1+2\triangle)\geq 2\gamma_1-\alpha_1-1+2\triangle\geq\gamma_1-\alpha_1+10\triangle.$$

As we showed above the only possible eigenvalue of B_{23} from the interval $(\gamma_4-\alpha_1+\triangle,\mu_2)$ is $\lambda_{k_1+1}(B_{23})$, that is $\lambda_{k_1+1}(B_{23})=\alpha_2+\alpha_3-t_i$. Therefore, $s\leq 2$ and the set $\sigma(B_{23})\cap(\gamma_5-\alpha_1+\triangle,1-2\triangle]$ has at most three points $t_1^*\leq t_2^*\leq t_3^*$ with the properties $t_1^*\leq\alpha_2<\mu_2\leq t_2^*$ and $t_1^*+t_3^*=\alpha_2+\alpha_3$. Hence

$$t_3^*-t_1^*\geq\mu_2-\alpha_2=(\mu_2-\gamma_1)+(\gamma_1-\alpha_2)\geq(-\epsilon/6+\triangle)+((\epsilon/2-2\triangle)=\epsilon/3.$$

From definition of μ_i's we know that $10\triangle<\mu_4-\mu_3<\mu_3-\mu_2\leq\epsilon/18$. So by Derichlet principle there exist $r\in\{2,3,4\}$ such that $|\mu_r-t_i^*|>4\triangle$ for every $i=1,2,3$. It means that

$$\forall i=1,\dots n,|\mu_r-\lambda_i(B_{23})|>4\triangle. \tag{26}$$

Let h be the eigenvector of A with the eigenvalue μ_r. We define the vector v by the formula $v=P_1h$. It is a nonzero vector because $\mu_r\notin\sigma(B_{23}$. Let P_v be the orthogonal rank one projection defined by $P_vz=(z,v)v/\|v\|^2$. The operator $\alpha_1P_v+\alpha_2P_2+\alpha_3P_3$ has the eigenvalue μ_r with the eigenvector h by construction. Denoting $B_3=\alpha_1P_v+B_{23}$, we have B_3 is a rank one perturbation of B_{23}. So by interlace theorem

$$\lambda_i(B_{23})\leq\lambda_i(B_3)\leq\lambda_{i+1}(B_{23}),\quad\forall i=1,\dots n-1 \tag{27}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_i(B_{23})=\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_i(B_3)-\alpha_1. \tag{28}$$

Note, that $B_3\leq A$, hence $\lambda_n(B_{23})\leq\gamma_4$. Subtracting one part of (28) from another and adding γ_4, we get

$$\lambda_1(B_{23})+\sum_{i=2}^n(\lambda_i(B_{23})-\lambda_{i-1}(B_3))-\lambda_n(B_3)+\alpha_1+\gamma_4=\gamma_4 \tag{29}$$

which is equivalent to

$$[\gamma_4-\lambda_n(B_3)]+\sum_{i=2}^n[\lambda_i(B_{23})-\lambda_{i-1}(B_3)]=\gamma_4-\alpha_1-\lambda_1(B_{23})). \tag{30}$$

We note that every summand of (30) in brackets is nonnegative. Also one of eigenvalue of B_3, say $\lambda_{i^*}(B_3)$, coincides with μ_2. From (26) we conclude that the corresponding expression in the brackets $\lambda_{i^*}(B_{23})-\lambda_{i^*-1}(B_3)$ is greater than $4\triangle$. So the left part of (30) is greater $4\triangle$. Taking into account (25), we see that the right part of (30) is less or equal $2\triangle$. So the equation (30) is not valid and therefore A is not a linear combination of 3 orthoprojections in this case either. □

Corollary 4.7. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \geq 76$. The matrix* $\operatorname{diag}(A, \gamma_4 I_{m-76})$ *is not a real linear combination of* 3 *orthoprojections.*

Proof. It is a direct application of the same arguments as the arguments to A in Proposition 4.6. □

Concluding remarks.

1. The scheme of the proof of Theorem 3.1 can be directly applied to decompositions of finite matrices in unitary space, since every Hermitian matrix with zero trace is a self-commutator [20]. For example, for a $2n \times 2n$ matrix A, we put $\lambda = \operatorname{tr} A/n$ and then take all steps according to the proof. If A is a $2n+1 \times 2n+1$ matrix, it is enough to consider the case $A = \operatorname{diag}(\mu, A_1)$ with $|\mu| = \|A\|$. Here the orthoprojections P_i will be of the form $\hat{P}_i = \operatorname{diag}(1, P_i)$, $i = 1, 3$ and $\hat{P}_i = \operatorname{diag}(0, P_i)$, $i = 2, 4$ where P_i are orthoprojections from the decomposition of A_1 into the linear combinations of 4 orthoprojections with the restriction $a - c = \mu$ on the coefficients in the proof of Theorem 3.1 .

2. In view of Proposition 4.6, it is interesting to know what is the maximal number n for which every Hermitian $k \times k$ matrix is a real linear combination of three orthoprojections providing $k \leq n$. We suppose it is not greater than 25 since many cases of the proof of Proposition 4.6 can be applied directly for smaller value of n.

References

[1] A. Böttcher , I. M. Spitkovsky, A gentle guide to the basics of two projections theory, Linear Algebra Appl. 432 (2010) 1412–1459.

[2] S. Goldstein and A. Paszkiewicz, Linear Combinations of Projections in von Neumann Algebras, Proc. AMS 116(1) (1992) 175-183.

[3] I. S. Feshchenko, On closeness of the sum of n subspaces of a Hilbert space, Ukrainian Math. J. 63(10) (2012) 1566–1622.

[4] P. A. Fillmore, On sums of projections, J. Funct. Anal. 4 (1969) 146–152.

[5] P. A. Fillmore, Sums of operators with square zero, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 28 (1967), 285–288.

[6] P. R. Halmos, Two subspaces, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 144 (1969) 381-389.

[7] R. E. Hartwig, M. S. Putcha, When is a matrix a sum of idempotents? Linear and Multilinear Algebra 26 (1990) 279–286.

[8] H. Hochstadt, One dimensional perturbations of compact operators, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 37(2) (1973) 465-467.

[9] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, Matrix analysis, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.

[10] S. Kruglyak, V. Rabanovich and Yu. Samoĭlenko, Decomposition of a scalar matrix into a sum of orthogonal projections, Linear Algebra Appl. 370 (2003) 217-225.

[11] S. A. Kruglyak, V. I. Rabanovich and Yu. S. Samoĭlenko, On sums of projections, Funct. Anal. Appl. 36(3) (2002) 182–195.

[12] K. Matsumoto, Self-adjoint operators as a real span of 5 projections, Math. Japon. 29 (1984) 291–294.

[13] Y. Nakamura, Every Hermitian matrix is a linear combination of four projections, Linear Algebra Appl. 61 (1984) 133–139.

[14] K. Nishio, The structure of real linear combination of two projections, Linear Algebra Appl. 66 (1985) 169–176.

[15] A. Paszkiewicz, Any self-adjoint operator is a finite linear combination of projections, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Math. 28 (1980) 227–245.

[16] C. Pearcy, D. Topping, Sums of small numbers of idempotents, Mich Math. J. 14 (1967) 453–465.

[17] V. I. Rabanovych, On the decomposition of a diagonal operator into a linear combination of idempotents or projectors, Ukrainian Math. J. 57(3) (2005), 466–473.

[18] S. Rabanovich, A. A. Yusenko, On decompositions of the identity operator into a linear combination of orthogonal projections, Meth. Func. Anal. Topology 16(1) (2010) 57–68.

[19] H. Radjavi, Structure of $A^*A - AA^*$, J. Math. Mech. 16 (1966) 19–26.

[20] R. C. Thompson, On Matrix Commutators, J. Washington Acad. Sci. 48 (1958) 306–307.

[21] H. Vasudeva, One dimensional perturbations of compact operators, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 57(1) (1976) 58-60.

[22] P. Y. Wu, Additive combinations of special operators, Funct. Analysis and Oper. Theory, Banach Center Publ., Warszawa, 30 (1994) 337–361.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, Tereshchenkivs'ka 3, Kyiv, 01601, Ukraine
E-mail address: slavik@imath.kiev.ua